

## Remarks/Arguments

### **Interview Summary**

Applicant thanks Supervisory Patent Examiner Janice A. Mooneyham and Examiner Paul R. Fisher for the telephone interview of January 12, 2010, wherein Supervisory Patent Examiner Mooneyham and Examiner Fisher and Applicant's representatives Bradley M. Ganz and Joel Lohrmeyer discussed the pending claims, present rejections, and ways of positioning the claims for allowance.

In particular, applicant's representatives summarized generally the inventive concept including, but not limited to, starting with a content document (e.g., web page) from a content provider, wherein the content document may not have all of the content desired by a user (e.g., hyperlinks to other reference or shopping web pages). The process uses a central computer system to aid in modifying the content document either directly or by generating annotation instructions for a client computer to make modifications. The content document is modified based on the use of key words to provide additional access to content and annotating the original content document (e.g., web page) so that it is rendered on a user computer with the annotation for accessing additional content (e.g., web page with additional hyperlinks). The modification steps are performed on a computer system other than the content provider's computer system. The Examiner's seemed to agree that this process is not performed in the cited Price Watch system, which relates to interactions Price Watch and a client, without any involvement of a central computer that generates communicates data or instructions relating to how the client computer can modify a content document from a content provider.

The parties discussed several of the independent claims, including claims 1, 33 and 64 and the corresponding rejections of anticipation by Price Watch. The Examiners acknowledged that as used in the rejection, Price Watch served as both a content provider, as well as a central computer system but suggested that the claims should better clarify the roles of the systems.

The Examiners' also expressed concerns that the claims did not specify whether a computer or a human participated in the recited methods.

Applicant now submits this supplemental response with additional claim amendments and new claims. The claims as listed assume the amendments made in Applicant's response of January 4, 2010 have been entered and additional amendments are submitted herein.

Applicant understands that the current amendments and remarks are in addition to and will supplement the response filed on January 4, 2010.

### **Amendments and New Claims**

Claims 1-59, and 64-67 are pending in this application.

More specifically, claims 1, 20, 22, 27, 33, 45, 48, 49, 53, 54, 64, 65, 66, and 67 are currently amended. These amendments do not add new matter because they are supported by a number of statements and figures in the specification. For example, the amendment of claim 1 is based on a chain of dependency of claims 1, 16 and 17. Claims 16 and 17 are therefore cancelled.

The current amendment are for clarifying purposes and they emphasize points patentably distinctions and Applicant's remarks and arguments from its previous response. Therefore Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the previously submitted remarks and arguments, all grounds of rejection are traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### **CONCLUSION**


Applicant submits that in view of the foregoing remarks and/or amendments in conjunction with prior filed remarks and/or amendments, the application is in condition for allowance, and favorable action is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, including extension fees, or to charge any additional fees or underpayments, including extra claim fees, or to credit any

overpayments, to the Credit Card account referenced and authorized via the EFS Web (Electronic Filing System). As an alternative, in case the Credit Card cannot be processed, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, additional fees, or underpayments, or to credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. 50-1001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 8, 2010

  
/Bradley M. Ganz/  
Bradley M. Ganz, Reg. No. 34,170  
P. O. Box 2200  
Hillsboro, Oregon 97123  
Telephone: (503) 844-9009  
Facsimile: (503) 296-2172  
email: [mail@ganzlaw.com](mailto:mail@ganzlaw.com)